

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Restriction Requirement mailed August 16, 2006, applicant elects  
I. Claims 1-14, drawn to the die ejector system.

The restriction requirement is respectfully traversed.


Claim 15 has been amended to add the element by which the die is removed from the adhesive surface. With this change to claim 15, a comparison of claims 1 and 15 will show that there is a method step analog in claim 15 for each of the apparatus elements in claims 1, and vice versa. The Office Action says that the process can be practiced by a different apparatus or the apparatus can practice another process. With the present sets of claims, that is not believed to be accurate. The claimed process in Group II cannot be practiced by another and materially different apparatus and the apparatus cannot be used to practice another materially different process. In making this determination, one should look at the claims themselves.

In addition, it is noted that most dependent claims in each claim group have an analog in the other claim group. It is submitted that the apparatus and the process are so similar to each other that they clearly involve the same inventive concept and a search as to one invention is likely to overlap the other. Because of these considerations, it is submitted that the two groups of claims are not independent and distinct, but rather are quite similar and not materially different and should be examined together.

The reference to a species election is noted. As there are no separate species identified, no species election has been provided.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING  
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY  
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
EFS FILING SYSTEM  
ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2006

  
Robert C. Faber  
Registration No.: 24,322  
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8403  
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF:ms